representative present may be relevant to the contributory negligence issue raised by the hold harmless provision, defendants will be permitted to question Mr. Stewart regarding that decision.

22

23

24

25

26

¹ This matter can be decided on the papers submitted by the parties. Plaintiffs' request for oral argument is DENIED.

ORDER GRANTING IN PART PLAINTIFFS' MOTION IN LIMINE REGARDING GRANT STEWART'S OPINION TESTIMONY

Whether Mr. Stewart will be permitted to provide opinion testimony regarding the wisdom of Mr. Mortillaro's decision will depend on the question asked. The relevant issue is the City's negligence at the time the decision was made: questions designed to elicit testimony on that issue would be appropriate. Asking broad questions regarding whether Mr. Stewart regrets how the decision not to hire the Lummi ultimately played out establishes nothing other than the fact that Mr. Stewart would have liked to avoid this entire dispute: such information is neither relevant nor helpful to the jury. For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiffs' motion to exclude the opinion testimony of Grant Stewart is GRANTED in part and RESERVED in part. DATED this 12th day of May, 2006. MWS Casnik United States District Judge

-2-

ORDER GRANTING IN PART PLAINTIFFS' MOTION IN LIMINE REGARDING GRANT STEWART'S OPINION TESTIMONY